

Serial No.: 09/685,138  
Docket No.: 112-1001  
Amendment dated October 24, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of July 24, 2008

## **REMARKS**

### **Introduction**

Applicant also notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that each of the references cited in the Information Disclosure Statement of April 16, 2008 has been considered.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1, 2, 4-8, 22-28 and 31-46 are pending in the application without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 8, 25-27, 33, 38, 41, 42, and 46 have been amended. Claims 3, 9-21, and 29-30 have been canceled. No new matter is being presented. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all the pending claims are requested.

### **Election/Restrictions**

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that:

[n]ewly submitted claims 44-45 are directed to inventions that are independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons:

Claim 44 is directed to an invention in which an absence of a computer readable readable [sic] code on a portable security device prevents an operating system of the data processing system from booting;

Claim 45 is directed to an invention in which an integrated circuit memory to store therein data of the data processing system is sufficient to substitute for a floppy disk drive thereof.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 44-45 relate to a "portable security device for a USB-supporting data processing system," which is the same as independent claims 1 and 33.

With regard to claim 44, this claim recites, among other things,

a USB interface enclosed within the housing and electrically interposed between the USB connector and the memory to provide the computer readable code to the data processing system, the absence of which preventing an operating system of the data processing system from booting.

Applicant submits that this is a similar variation of

displaying an error message when the password on the USB security device does not match the password stored in the host computer and preventing the

Serial No.: 09/685,138  
Docket No.: 112-1001  
Amendment dated October 24, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of July 24, 2008

host computer from being booted when the password on the USB security device does not match the password stored in the host computer (emphasis added)

that is recited in independent claim 25.

With regard to claim 45, this claim recites, among other things, “an integrated circuit memory to store therein data of the data processing system sufficient to substitute for a floppy disk drive thereof” (emphasis added). Applicant respectfully submits that this is a similar variation of the recitation of “*an integrated circuit memory* for writing/reading data” (emphasis added) in claims 1 and 33.

Applicant respectfully submits that given the similarities of the variations of Applicant’s portable security device for a USB-supporting data processing system, an unduly and burdensome search would not be necessary.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the election/restriction requirement for claims 44 and 45, and reconsideration of these claims are earnestly solicited.

### **Objections**

The Examiner has objected to claims 1 and 25-27 due to informalities. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 25-27 in order to address the Examiner’s concerns and to expedite prosecution of the above-identified patent application.

Accordingly, reconsideration of these claims and withdrawal of these objections are earnestly solicited.

### **Rejection under 35 USC §112**

Claims 41-42 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Applicant has amended claims 38, 41, and 42 in order to address the Examiner’s concerns and to expedite prosecution of the above-identified patent application.

Accordingly, reconsideration of these claims and withdrawal of these objections are earnestly solicited.

Serial No.: 09/685,138  
Docket No.: 112-1001  
Amendment dated October 24, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of July 24, 2008

### **Rejection under 35 USC §112**

Claims 1-2, 4-8, 22-24 and 32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 8 in order to address the Examiner's concerns and to expedite prosecution of the above-identified patent application. Accordingly, reconsideration of these claims and withdrawal of these rejections are earnestly solicited.

### **Rejection under 35 USC §103**

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 22-24, 33-40 and 43 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,671,808 to Abbott et al. (hereinafter "Abbott") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,599,196 to Powell et al. (hereinafter "Powell") in view of PTO No 2007-2593 (translation of CN 203264U) to Liu (hereinafter "Lui") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,062,881 to Ellison (hereinafter "Ellison"). Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 22-24, 33-40 and 43 have been alternately rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Abbott in view of Powell and Liu. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 22-24, 33-40 and 43 have been also alternately rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Abbott in view of Powell and Ellison. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited.

#### **Claim 1**

Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite, among other things,

a connector cover elastically biased against an external surface of the portable memory device to cover the USB connector when the portable memory device is not connected to the USB-supporting data processing system thereby protecting the USB connector from damage, the elastically biased connector cover being slidably retractable over the external surface of the portable memory device to expose the USB connector when connected to the USB port.

On page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges and Applicant agrees that Abbott fails to teach or suggest

a connector cover elastically biased to cover the USB connector when the portable memory device is not connected to the USB-supporting data processing system thereby protecting the USB connector from damage, the connector cover being slidably retractable against the elastic bias to expose the USB connector to

Serial No.: 09/685,138  
Docket No.: 112-1001  
Amendment dated October 24, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of July 24, 2008

be connected to the USB port.

On pages 8 and 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Powell describes “a connector cover [14, FIGs. 9-12] elastically biased to cover connector [104, 108 – FIG. 1] when the connector is not connected to a receptacle [FIGs. 9-10] thereby protecting the connector from damage” and “the connector cover being slidably retractable against the elastic bias [30, FIG. 1] to expose the connector when the connector is connected to the receptacle [FIGs. 11-12].” The Examiner also contends that

[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a connector cover, as is taught by Powell, in order to prevent external exposure of the USB connector and to provide protection to the USB connector when the memory device is not connected to the USB-supporting data processing system – thereby protecting the connector from damage.

Applicant respectfully submits that Abbott and Powell, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest, among other things,

a connector cover elastically biased against an external surface of the portable memory device to cover the USB connector when the portable memory device is not connected to the USB-supporting data processing system thereby protecting the USB connector from damage, the elastically biased connector cover being slidably retractable over the external surface of the portable memory device to expose the USB connector when connected to the USB port.

In contrast, Powell illustrates in FIGS. 9 and 10 that retractable sheath 14 retracts *within* body 16 and cap 18, and that sheath 14 is biased against *springs* – retractable sheath 14 is not a “connector cover” that is “elastically biased *against an external surface*” of a “portable memory device” where the “connector cover” is “*slidably retractable over the external surface* of the portable memory device” (emphasis added).

Since Abbott and Powell, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest every element as recited in Applicant’s independent claim 1, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable and deemed to be allowable.

On page 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Liu describes

a connector cover [13, FIG. 2] elastically biased to cover a connector [8, FIG. 2] when the connector is not connected to a receptacle [FIG. 2; page 3, line 6] thereby protecting the connector from damage [page 3, line 2], the connector cover being slidably retractable against the elastic bias [10, FIG. 2] to expose the connector when the connector is connected to the receptacle [page 5, lines 16-

19].

The Examiner further contends that

[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a connector cover, as is taught by Powell, in order to protect the USB connector from being damaged and to prevent external exposure of the USB connector when the memory device is not connected to the USB-supporting data processing system – as is suggested by Liu and Powell.

Applicant respectfully submits that Abbott, Powell, and Liu, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest, among other things,

a connector cover elastically biased against an external surface of the portable memory device to cover the USB connector when the portable memory device is not connected to the USB-supporting data processing system thereby protecting the USB connector from damage, the elastically biased connector cover being slidably retractable over the external surface of the portable memory device to expose the USB connector when connected to the USB port.

In contrast, as discussed above, Powell illustrates in FIGS. 9 and 10 that retractable sheath 14 retracts *within* body 16 and cap 18, and that sheath 14 is biased against *springs* – retractable sheath 14 is not a “connector cover” that is “elastically biased *against an external surface*” of a “portable memory device” where the “connector cover” is “slidably retractable *over the external surface* of the portable memory device” (emphasis added). Although Liu illustrates in FIG. 2 that the protective lid 13 is slidably on insulating cover handle 4, Liu fails to teach or suggest that the protective lid 13 is “elastically biased *against an external surface*” of a “portable memory device” and where the “connector cover” is “slidably retractable *over the external surface* of the portable memory device” (emphasis added). At best, Liu illustrates in FIG. 2 that the protective lid 13 is *biased against the protective lid spring 10* -- *not* that the protective lid 13 is “elastically biased *against an external surface*” of a “portable memory device” (emphasis added).

Since Abbott, Powell, and Liu, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest every element as recited in Applicant’s independent claim 1, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable and deemed to be allowable.

On pages 9 and 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner still further contends that Ellison describes “a connector cover [60, FIG. 5] biased to cover a connector [50, FIG. 5] when the connector is not connected to a receptacle [FIG. 3] thereby protecting the connector from damage” and “the connector cover being slidably retractable against the elastic bias [75, FIG. 5]

Serial No.: 09/685,138  
Docket No.: 112-1001  
Amendment dated October 24, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of July 24, 2008

to expose the connector when the connector is connected to the receptacle [FIG. 4].” The Examiner contends that

[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a connector cover, as is taught by Powell, in order to prevent external exposure of the USB connector and to prevent objects from coming into contact with the USB connector – thereby protecting the USB connector from damage when the memory device is not connected to the USB-supporting data processing system (as are suggested by Powell and Ellison).

Applicant respectfully submits that Abbott, Powell, and Ellison, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest, among other things,

a connector cover elastically biased against an external surface of the portable memory device to cover the USB connector when the portable memory device is not connected to the USB-supporting data processing system thereby protecting the USB connector from damage, the elastically biased connector cover being slidably retractable over the external surface of the portable memory device to expose the USB connector when connected to the USB port.

In contrast, as discussed above, Powell illustrates in FIGS. 9 and 10 that retractable sheath 14 retracts *within* body 16 and cap 18, and that sheath 14 is biased against *springs* – retractable sheath 14 is not a “connector cover” that is “elastically biased *against an external surface*” of a “portable memory device” where the “connector cover” is “slidably retractable *over the external surface* of the portable memory device” (emphasis added). Ellison illustrates in FIGS. 2-4 that the blade cover member 60 is slidably *inserted* into casing 20, and that the blade cover member 60 is *biased against springs* 75. Thus, the blade cover member 60 is not a “connector cover” that is “elastically biased *against an external surface*” of a “portable memory device” where the “connector cover” is “slidably retractable *over the external surface* of the portable memory device” (emphasis added).

Since Abbott, Powell, and Ellison, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest every element as recited in Applicant’s independent claim 1, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable and deemed to be allowable.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim are earnestly solicited.

Serial No.: 09/685,138  
Docket No.: 112-1001  
Amendment dated October 24, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of July 24, 2008

Claims 2, 4-6, and 22-24

With regard to claims 2, 4-6, and 22-24, it is requested that for at least the reasons that these claims depend from allowable claim 1, and therefore contain each of the features as recited in claim 1, claims 2, 4-6, and 22-24 are also patentable over Abbott and Powell, or Abbott, Powell, and Liu, or Abbott, Powell, and Ellison, whether taken alone or in combination with one another.

Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections and allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited.

Claim 33

Applicant has amended claim 33 to recite, among other things,  
a retractable cover having a rectangular cross-section surrounding the USB connector, the retractable cover being elastically biased against an outer surface of the USB connector to protect the USB connector from damage when the portable memory device is not connected to the USB-supporting data processing system.

On page 11 of the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges and Applicant agrees that Abbott fails to teach or suggest

a retractable cover having a rectangular cross-section surrounding the USB connector, the retractable cover being elastically biased to protect the USB connector from damage when the portable memory device is not connected to the USB-supporting data processing system.

On page 11 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Powell describes

a retractable cover [14, FIGs. 9-12] having a rectangular cross-section surrounding a connector [14, FIG 1; col. 6, lines 47-53], the retractable cover being elastically biased to protect the connector from damage when the connector is not connected to a receptacle.

The Examiner further contends that

[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a retractable cover, as is taught by Powell, in order to prevent external exposure of the USB connector and to protect the USB connector from damage when the portable memory device is not connected to the USB-supporting data processing system.

Serial No.: 09/685,138  
Docket No.: 112-1001  
Amendment dated October 24, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of July 24, 2008

Applicant respectfully submits that Abbott and Powell, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest, among other things,

a retractable cover having a rectangular cross-section surrounding the USB connector, the retractable cover being elastically biased against an outer surface of the USB connector to protect the USB connector from damage when the portable memory device is not connected to the USB-supporting data processing system.

In contrast, Powell illustrates in FIGS. 9 and 10 that retractable sheath 14 retracts within body 16 and cap 18, and that sheath 14 is biased against springs – retractable sheath 14 is *not* “a retractable cover” that is “elastically biased *against an outer surface of the USB connector*” to “protect the USB connector from damage” (emphasis added). At best, Powell illustrates in FIGS. 9 and 10 that the retractable sheath 14 is biased against *springs* – not “against an outer surface” of a USB connector.

Since Abbott and Powell, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest every element as recited in Applicant’s independent claim 33, claim 33 is patentably distinguishable and deemed to be allowable.

On page 12 of the Office Action, the Examiner also contends that Liu describes “a retractable cover [13, FIG. 2] elastically biased to protect a connector [8, FIG. 2] from damage [page 3, line 2] when the connector is not connected to a receptacle [FIG. 2; page 3, line 6].” The Examiner contends that “[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a retractable cover, as is taught by Powell, in order to protect the USB connector from damage and to prevent external exposure of the USB connector when the portable memory device is not connected to the USB-supporting data processing system – as is suggested by Liu and Powell.”

Applicant respectfully submits that Abbott, Powell, and Liu, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest, among other things,

a retractable cover having a rectangular cross-section surrounding the USB connector, the retractable cover being elastically biased against an outer surface of the USB connector to protect the USB connector from damage when the portable memory device is not connected to the USB-supporting data processing system.

In contrast, Powell illustrates in FIGS. 9 and 10 that retractable sheath 14 retracts within body



Serial No.: 09/685,138  
Docket No.: 112-1001  
Amendment dated October 24, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of July 24, 2008

16 and cap 18, and that sheath 14 is biased against springs – retractable sheath 14 is *not* “a retractable cover” that is “elastically biased *against an outer surface of the USB connector*” to “protect the USB connector from damage” (emphasis added). At best, Powell illustrates in FIGS. 9 and 10 that the retractable sheath 14 is biased against *springs* – not “against an outer surface” of a USB connector. Although Liu illustrates in FIG. 2 that the protective lid 13 is slidable on insulating cover handle 4, Liu fails to teach or suggest that the protective lid 13 is “a retractable cover” that is “elastically biased *against an outer surface of the USB connector*” to “protect the USB connector from damage” (emphasis added). At best, Liu illustrates in FIG. 2 that the protective lid 13 is biased against the protective lid spring 10 -- *not* that the protective lid 13 is “a retractable cover” that is “elastically biased *against an outer surface of the USB connector*” to “protect the USB connector from damage” (emphasis added).

Since Abbott, Powell, and Liu, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest every element as recited in Applicant’s independent claim 33, claim 33 is patentably distinguishable and deemed to be allowable.

On page 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner still further contends that Ellison describes “a retractable cover [60, FIG. 5] elastically biased to protect a connector [50, FIG. 5] when the connector is not connected to a receptacle [FIG. 3] thereby protecting the connector from damage.” The Examiner contends that

[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a retractable cover, as is taught by Powell, in order to prevent external exposure of the USB connector and to prevent objects from coming into contact with the USB connector – thereby protecting the USB connector from damage when the portable memory device is not connected to the USB-supporting data processing system (as are suggested by Powell and Ellison.

Applicant respectfully submits that Abbott, Powell, and Ellison, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest, among other things,

a retractable cover having a rectangular cross-section surrounding the USB connector, the retractable cover being elastically biased against an outer surface of the USB connector to protect the USB connector from damage when the portable memory device is not connected to the USB-supporting data processing system.

In contrast, Powell illustrates in FIGS. 9 and 10 that retractable sheath 14 retracts within body

Serial No.: 09/685,138  
Docket No.: 112-1001  
Amendment dated October 24, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of July 24, 2008

16 and cap 18, and that sheath 14 is biased against springs – retractable sheath 14 is *not* “a retractable cover” that is “elastically biased *against an outer surface of the USB connector*” to “protect the USB connector from damage” (emphasis added). At best, Powell illustrates in FIGS. 9 and 10 that the retractable sheath 14 is biased against *springs* – not “against an outer surface” of a USB connector. Ellison illustrates in FIGS. 2-4 that the blade cover member 60 is slidably inserted into casing 20 and *biased against springs* 75. Thus, the blade cover member 60 is not “a retractable cover” that is “elastically biased *against an outer surface of the USB connector*” to “protect the USB connector from damage” (emphasis added).

Since Abbott, Powell, and Ellison, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest every element as recited in Applicant's independent claim 33, claim 33 is patentably distinguishable and deemed to be allowable.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim are earnestly solicited.

#### Claims 34-40 and 43

With regard to claims 34-40 and 43, it is requested that for at least the reasons that these claims depend from allowable claim 33, and therefore contain each of the features as recited in claim 33, claims 34-40 and 43 are also patentable over Abbott and Powell, or Abbott, Powell, and Liu, or Abbott, Powell, and Ellison, whether taken alone or in combination with one another.

Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections and allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited.

#### Rejection under 35 USC §103

Claims 1 and 7-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,038,320 to Miller (hereinafter “Miller”) in view of Powell. Claims 1 and 7-8 have been alternatively rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller in view of Powell and Liu. Claims 1 and 7-8 have been also alternatively rejected under 35 U.S.C.

Serial No.: 09/685,138  
Docket No.: 112-1001  
Amendment dated October 24, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of July 24, 2008

§103(a) as being unpatentable Miller in view of Powell and Ellison. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of these claims are earnestly solicited.

#### Claim 1

Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite, among other things,

a connector cover elastically biased against an external surface of the portable memory device to cover the USB connector when the portable memory device is not connected to the USB-supporting data processing system thereby protecting the USB connector from damage, the elastically biased connector cover being slidably retractable over the external surface of the portable memory device to expose the USB connector when connected to the USB port.

On page 14 of the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges and Applicant agrees that Miller fails to teach or suggest

a connector cover elastically biased to cover the USB connector when the portable memory device is not connected to the USB-supporting data processing system thereby protecting the USB connector from damage, the connector cover being slidably retractable against the elastic bias to expose the USB connector to be connected to the USB port.

On page 14 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Powell describes “a connector cover [14, FIGs. 9-12] elastically biased to cover connector [104, 108 – FIG. 1] when the connector is not connected to a receptacle [FIGs. 9-10] thereby protecting the connector from damage” and “the connector cover being slidably retractable against the elastic bias [30, FIG. 1] to expose the connector when the connector is connected to the receptacle [FIGs. 11-12].” On pages 14 and 15, the Examiner contends that

[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a connector cover, as is taught by Powell, in order to prevent external exposure of the USB connector and to provide protection to the USB connector when the memory device is not connected to the USB-supporting data processing system – thereby protecting the connector from damage.

Applicant respectfully submits that Miller and Powell, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest, among other things,

a connector cover elastically biased against an external surface of the portable memory device to cover the USB connector when the portable memory device is not connected to the USB-supporting data processing system thereby protecting

Serial No.: 09/685,138  
Docket No.: 112-1001  
Amendment dated October 24, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of July 24, 2008

the USB connector from damage, the elastically biased connector cover being slidably retractable over the external surface of the portable memory device to expose the USB connector when connected to the USB port.

In contrast, Powell illustrates in FIGS. 9 and 10 that retractable sheath 14 retracts *within* body 16 and cap 18, and that sheath 14 is biased against *springs* – retractable sheath 14 is not a “connector cover” that is “elastically biased *against an external surface*” of a “portable memory device” where the “connector cover” is “slidably retractable *over the external surface* of the portable memory device” (emphasis added).

Since Abbott and Powell, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest every element as recited in Applicant’s independent claim 1, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable and deemed to be allowable.

On page 15 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Liu describes

a connector cover [13, FIG. 2] elastically biased to cover a connector [8, FIG. 2] when the connector is not connected to a receptacle [FIG. 2; page 3, line 6] thereby protecting the connector from damage [page 3, line 2], the connector cover being slidably retractable against the elastic bias [10, FIG. 2] to expose the connector when the connector is connected to the receptacle [page 5, lines 16-19].

The Examiner further contends that

[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a connector cover, as is taught by Powell, in order to protect the USB connector from being damaged and to prevent external exposure of the USB connector when the memory device is not connected to the USB-supporting data processing system – as is suggested by Liu and Powell.

Applicant respectfully submits that Miller, Powell, and Liu, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest, among other things,

a connector cover elastically biased against an external surface of the portable memory device to cover the USB connector when the portable memory device is not connected to the USB-supporting data processing system thereby protecting the USB connector from damage, the elastically biased connector cover being slidably retractable over the external surface of the portable memory device to expose the USB connector when connected to the USB port.

In contrast, as discussed above, Powell illustrates in FIGS. 9 and 10 that retractable sheath 14 retracts *within* body 16 and cap 18, and that sheath 14 is biased against *springs* – retractable sheath 14 is not a “connector cover” that is “elastically biased *against an external surface*” of a

Serial No.: 09/685,138  
Docket No.: 112-1001  
Amendment dated October 24, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of July 24, 2008

“portable memory device” where the “connector cover” is “slidably retractable *over the external surface* of the portable memory device” (emphasis added). Although Liu illustrates in FIG. 2 that the protective lid 13 is slidable on insulating cover handle 4, Liu fails to teach or suggest that the protective lid 13 is “elastically biased *against an external surface*” of a “portable memory device” and where the “connector cover” is “slidably retractable *over the external surface* of the portable memory device” (emphasis added). At best, Liu illustrates in FIG. 2 that the protective lid 13 is biased against the protective lid spring 10 -- *not* that the protective lid 13 is “elastically biased *against an external surface*” of a “portable memory device” (emphasis added).

Since Miller, Powell, and Liu, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest every element as recited in Applicant’s independent claim 1, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable and deemed to be allowable.

On pages 15 and 16 of the Office Action, the Examiner still further contends that Ellison describes “a connector cover [60, FIG. 5] elastically biased to cover a connector [50, FIG. 5] when the connector is not connected to a receptacle [FIG. 3] thereby protecting the connector from damage” and “the connector cover being slidably retractable against the elastic bias [75, FIG. 5] to expose the connector when the connector is connected to the receptacle [FIG. 4].” On page 16 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that

[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a connector cover, as is taught by Powell, in order to prevent external exposure of the USB connector and to prevent objects from coming into contact with the USB connector – thereby protecting the USB connector from damage when the memory device is not connected to the USB-supporting data processing system (as are suggested by Powell and Ellison).

Applicant respectfully submits that Miller, Powell, and Ellison, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest, among other things,

a connector cover elastically biased against an external surface of the portable memory device to cover the USB connector when the portable memory device is not connected to the USB-supporting data processing system thereby protecting the USB connector from damage, the elastically biased connector cover being slidably retractable over the external surface of the portable memory device to expose the USB connector when connected to the USB port.

In contrast, as discussed above, Powell illustrates in FIGS. 9 and 10 that retractable sheath 14 retracts *within* body 16 and cap 18, and that sheath 14 is biased against *springs* – retractable

Serial No.: 09/685,138  
Docket No.: 112-1001  
Amendment dated October 24, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of July 24, 2008

sheath 14 is not a “connector cover” that is “elastically biased *against an external surface*” of a “portable memory device” where the “connector cover” is “slidably retractable *over the external surface* of the portable memory device” (emphasis added). Ellison illustrates in FIGS. 2-4 that the blade cover member 60 is slidably *inserted* into casing 20, and that blade cover member 60 is *biased against casing 20 by springs 75*. Thus, the blade cover member 60 is not a “connector cover” that is “elastically biased *against an external surface*” of a “portable memory device” where the “connector cover” is “slidably retractable *over the external surface* of the portable memory device” (emphasis added).

Since Miller, Powell, and Ellison, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest every element as recited in Applicant’s independent claim 1, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable and deemed to be allowable.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim are earnestly solicited.

#### Claims 7 and 8

With regard to claims 7 and 8, it is requested that for at least the reasons that these claims depend from allowable claim 1, and therefore contain each of the features as recited in claim 1, claims 7 and 8 are also patentable over Miller and Powell, or Miller, Powell, and Liu, or Miller, Powell, and Ellison, whether taken alone or in combination with one another.

Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections and allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited.

#### Rejection under 35 USC §103

Claims 25-28, 31-32 and 46 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,292,890 to Crisan (hereinafter “Crisan”) and further in view of Powell. Claims 25-28, 31-32 and 46 have been alternatively rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller in view of Crisan, and further in view of Powell and Liu. Claims 25-28, 31-32 and 46 have been also alternatively rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller in view of Crisan and further in view of Powell

Serial No.: 09/685,138  
Docket No.: 112-1001  
Amendment dated October 24, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of July 24, 2008

and Ellison. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of these claims are earnestly solicited.

#### Claim 25

Applicant has amended claim 25 to recite, among other things,

attaching the USB security device to the USB port of the host computer prior to when power is applied to the host computer, the attaching operation comprising automatically sliding a cover that is elastically biased against an external surface of the USB security device backward over the exterior surface of the USB security device in a direction opposite to a direction of inserting the USB security device into the USB port when the USB security device is attached to the USB port of the host computer.

On page 18 of the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges and Applicant agrees that Miller fails to teach or suggest “the attaching operation comprising automatically sliding a cover on the USB security device backward in a direction opposite to a direction of inserting the USB security device into the USB port when the USB security device is attached to the USB port of the host computer.” The Examiner contends that Powell describes

automatically sliding a cover [14, FIGs. 11-12] on a plug backward in a direction opposite a direction of inserting the plug into a port when the plug is attached to the port to expose a connector of the plug only when inserted into the port [FIGs. 11-12], and to cover the connector when the plug is not inserted into the port [FIGs. 9-10] thereby protecting the connector from damage.

The Examiner contends that

[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a sliding cover, as is taught by Powell, on the USB security device – hence automatically sliding a cover [14, FIGs. 11-12] on the USB security device backward in a direction opposite a direction of inserting the USB security device into the USB port of the host computer when the USB connector is attached to the USB port to expose the USB connector only when inserted into the USB port, in order to prevent external exposure of the USB connector and to protect the USB connector.

Applicant respectfully submits that Miller and Powell, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest, among other things,

Serial No.: 09/685,138  
Docket No.: 112-1001  
Amendment dated October 24, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of July 24, 2008

attaching the USB security device to the USB port of the host computer prior to when power is applied to the host computer, the attaching operation comprising automatically sliding a cover that is elastically biased against an external surface of the USB security device backward over the exterior surface of the USB security device in a direction opposite to a direction of inserting the USB security device into the USB port when the USB security device is attached to the USB port of the host computer.

In contrast, Powell illustrates in FIGS. 9 and 10 that retractable sheath 14 retracts *within* body 16 and cap 18, and that sheath 14 is biased against *springs* – the retractable sheath 14 is not “elastically biased against an external surface” of a USB security device, nor is it “retracted backward *over the exterior surface* of the USB security device” (emphasis added).

Since Miller and Powell, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest every element as recited in Applicant’s independent claim 25, claim 25 is patentably distinguishable and deemed to be allowable.

On page 19 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Liu describes

sliding a cover [13, FIG. 2] on a plug [FIG. 2 backward in a direction opposite a direction of inserting the plug into a port when the plug is attached to the port to expose a connector [8, FIG. 2] of the plug only when inserted into the port, and to cover the connector when the plug is not inserted into the port thereby protecting the connector from damage [FIG. 2; page 3, line 6; page 3, line 2].

The Examiner contends that

“[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a sliding cover, as is taught by Powell, on the USB security device in order to protect the USB connector from being damaged and to prevent external exposure of the USB connector – as is suggested by Liu and Powell.

Applicant respectfully submits that Miller, Powell, and Liu, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest, among other things,

attaching the USB security device to the USB port of the host computer prior to when power is applied to the host computer, the attaching operation comprising automatically sliding a cover that is elastically biased against an external surface of the USB security device backward over the exterior surface of the USB security device in a direction opposite to a direction of inserting the USB security device into the USB port when the USB security device is attached to the USB port of the host computer.



Serial No.: 09/685,138  
Docket No.: 112-1001  
Amendment dated October 24, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of July 24, 2008

In contrast, Powell illustrates in FIGS. 9 and 10 that retractable sheath 14 retracts *within* body 16 and cap 18, and that sheath 14 is biased against *springs* – the retractable sheath 14 is not “elastically biased against an external surface” of a USB security device, nor is it “retracted backward *over the exterior surface* of the USB security device” (emphasis added). Although Liu illustrates in FIG. 2 that the protective lid 13 is slidable on insulating cover handle 4, Liu fails to teach or suggest that the protective lid 13 is “elastically biased against *an external surface*” of a USB security device (emphasis added). At best, Liu illustrates in FIG. 2 that the protective lid 13 is *biased against the protective lid spring 10* -- *not* that the protective lid 13 is “elastically biased *against an external surface*” (emphasis added) of the USB security device.

Since Miller, Powell, and Liu, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest every element as recited in Applicant’s independent claim 25, claim 25 is patentably distinguishable and deemed to be allowable.

On page 19 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Ellison describes

automatically sliding a cover [60, FIG. 5] on a plug [10, FIG. 5] backward in a direction opposite a direction of inserting the plug into a port when the plug is attached to the port to expose a connector of the plug only when inserted into the port [FIG. 4], and to cover the connector when the plug is not inserted into the port [FIG. 3] thereby protecting the connector from damage.

On pages 19 and 20 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that

[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a sliding cover, as is taught by Powell, on the USB security device in order to prevent external exposure of the USB connector and to prevent objects from coming into contact with the USB connector, and thereby protecting the USB connector from damage – as are suggested by Powell and Ellison.

Applicant respectfully submits that Miller, Powell, and Ellison, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest, among other things,

attaching the USB security device to the USB port of the host computer prior to when power is applied to the host computer, the attaching operation comprising automatically sliding a cover that is elastically biased against an external surface of the USB security device backward over the exterior surface of the USB security device in a direction opposite to a direction of inserting the USB security device into the USB port when the USB security device is attached to the USB port of the host computer.

Serial No.: 09/685,138  
Docket No.: 112-1001  
Amendment dated October 24, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of July 24, 2008

In contrast, Powell illustrates in FIGS. 9 and 10 that retractable sheath 14 retracts *within* body 16 and cap 18, and that sheath 14 is biased against *springs* – the retractable sheath 14 is not “elastically biased against an external surface” of a USB security device, nor is it “retracted backward *over the exterior surface* of the USB security device” (emphasis added). Ellison illustrates in FIGS. 2-4 that the blade cover member 60 is slidably *inserted* into casing 20, and that blade cover member 60 is *biased against casing 20 by springs 75*. Thus, the blade cover member 60 is not “elastically biased against an external surface” of a USB security device, nor is it “retracted backward *over the exterior surface* of the USB security device” (emphasis added).

Since Miller, Powell, and Ellison, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest every element as recited in Applicant’s independent claim 25, claim 25 is patentably distinguishable and deemed to be allowable.

Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections and allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited.

#### Claims 26-28 and 31

With regard to claims 26-28 and 31, it is requested that for at least the reasons that these claims depend from allowable claim 25, and therefore contain each of the features as recited in claim 25, claims 26-28 are also patentable Miller, Crisan, and Powell, or Miller, Crisan, Powell and Liu, or Miller, Crisan, Powell and Ellison, whether taken alone or in combination with one another.

Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections and allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited.

#### Claim 32

With regard to claim 32, it is requested that for at least the reason that this claim depends from allowable claim 1, and therefore contains each of the features as recited in claim 1, claim 32 is also patentable over Miller, Crisan, and Powell, or Miller, Crisan, Powell and Liu, or Miller, Crisan, Powell and Ellison, whether taken alone or in combination with one another.

Serial No.: 09/685,138  
Docket No.: 112-1001  
Amendment dated October 24, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of July 24, 2008

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim is earnestly solicited.

#### Claim 46

Applicant has amended claim 46 to recite, among other things, attaching the USB security device to the USB port of the host computer prior to the power being applied thereto, the attaching including inserting the USB security device into the USB port and thereby retracting a cover that is elastically biased against a connector and surrounds the connector on the USB security device by engaging with a periphery of the USB port responsive to the insertion of the USB security device.

On page 21 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Miller, Powell, Liu, and Ellison describe

the attaching including inserting the USB security device into the USB port and thereby retracting a cover surrounding a connector on the USB security device by engaging with a periphery of the USB port response to the insertion of the USB security device (see teaching of Miller, Powell, Liu and Ellison and bases of rejection of claim 25 above).

On page 18 of the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges and Applicant agrees that Miller fails to teach or suggest “the attaching operation comprising automatically sliding a cover on the USB security device backward in a direction opposite to a direction of inserting the USB security device into the USB port when the USB security device is attached to the USB port of the host computer.” The Examiner contends that Powell describes

automatically sliding a cover [14, FIGs. 11-12] on a plug backward in a direction opposite a direction of inserting the plug into a port when the plug is attached to the port to expose a connector of the plug only when inserted into the port [FIGs. 11-12], and to cover the connector when the plug is not inserted into the port [FIGs. 9-10] thereby protecting the connector from damage.

The Examiner contends that

[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a sliding cover, as is taught by Powell, on the USB security device – hence automatically sliding a cover [14, FIGs. 11-12] on the USB security device backward in a direction opposite a direction of inserting the USB security device into the USB port of the host computer when the USB connector is attached to the USB port to expose the USB connector only when inserted into the USB port, in order to prevent external exposure of the USB

Serial No.: 09/685,138  
Docket No.: 112-1001  
Amendment dated October 24, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of July 24, 2008

connector and to protect the USB connector.

Applicant respectfully submits that Miller and Powell, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest, among other things,

attaching the USB security device to the USB port of the host computer prior to the power being applied thereto, the attaching including inserting the USB security device into the USB port and thereby retracting a cover that is elastically biased against a connector and surrounds the connector on the USB security device by engaging with a periphery of the USB port responsive to the insertion of the USB security device.

In contrast, Powell illustrates in FIGS. 9 and 10 that retractable sheath 14 retracts within body 16 and cap 18, and that the sheath 14 is *biased by springs*. The retractable sheath 14 is not “*elastically biased against a connector*” and “surrounds the connector” on a “USB security device” that is retractable “by engaging with a periphery of the USB port responsive to the insertion of the USB security device” (emphasis added).

Since Miller and Powell, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest every element as recited in Applicant’s independent claim 46, claim 46 is patentably distinguishable and deemed to be allowable.

On page 19 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Liu describes

sliding a cover [13, FIG. 2] on a plug [FIG. 2 backward in a direction opposite a direction of inserting the plug into a port when the plug is attached to the port to expose a connector [8, FIG. 2] of the plug only when inserted into the port, and to cover the connector when the plug is not inserted into the port thereby protecting the connector from damage [FIG. 2; page 3, line 6; page 3, line 2].

The Examiner contends that

“[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a sliding cover, as is taught by Powell, on the USB security device in order to protect the USB connector from being damaged and to prevent external exposure of the USB connector – as is suggested by Liu and Powell.

Applicant respectfully submits that Miller, Powell, and Liu, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest, among other things,

attaching the USB security device to the USB port of the host computer prior to the power being applied thereto, the attaching including inserting the USB security device into the USB port and thereby retracting a cover that is elastically biased against a connector and surrounds the connector on the USB security

Serial No.: 09/685,138  
Docket No.: 112-1001  
Amendment dated October 24, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of July 24, 2008

device by engaging with a periphery of the USB port responsive to the insertion of the USB security device.

In contrast, Powell illustrates in FIGS. 9 and 10 that retractable sheath 14 retracts within body 16 and cap 18, and that the sheath 14 is *biased by springs*. The retractable sheath 14 is not “*elastically biased against a connector*” and “surrounds the connector” on a “USB security device” that is retractable “by engaging with a periphery of the USB port responsive to the insertion of the USB security device” (emphasis added). Although Liu illustrates in FIG. 2 that the protective lid 13 is slidable on insulating cover handle 4, Liu fails to teach or suggest that the protective lid 13 is “elastically biased against a connector” of a USB security device. At best, Liu illustrates in FIG. 2 that the protective lid 13 is biased against the protective lid spring 10 -- *not* that the protective lid 13 is “elastically biased *against a connector*” (emphasis added) of the USB security device.

Since Miller, Powell, and Liu, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest every element as recited in Applicant’s independent claim 46, claim 46 is patentably distinguishable and deemed to be allowable.

On page 19 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Ellison describes

automatically sliding a cover [60, FIG. 5] on a plug [10, FIG. 5] backward in a direction opposite a direction of inserting the plug into a port when the plug is attached to the port to expose a connector of the plug only when inserted into the port [FIG. 4], and to cover the connector when the plug is not inserted into the port [FIG. 3] thereby protecting the connector from damage.

On pages 19 and 20 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that

[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a sliding cover, as is taught by Powell, on the USB security device in order to prevent external exposure of the USB connector and to prevent objects from coming into contact with the USB connector, and thereby protecting the USB connector from damage – as are suggested by Powell and Ellison.

Applicant respectfully submits that Miller, Powell, and Ellison, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest, among other things,

attaching the USB security device to the USB port of the host computer prior to the power being applied thereto, the attaching including inserting the USB security device into the USB port and thereby retracting a cover that is elastically biased against a connector and surrounds the connector on the USB security

Serial No.: 09/685,138  
Docket No.: 112-1001  
Amendment dated October 24, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of July 24, 2008

device by engaging with a periphery of the USB port responsive to the insertion of the USB security device.

In contrast, Powell illustrates in FIGS. 9 and 10 that retractable sheath 14 retracts within body 16 and cap 18, and that the sheath 14 is *biased by springs*. The retractable sheath 14 is not “*elastically biased against a connector*” and “surrounds the connector” on a “USB security device” that is retractable “by engaging with a periphery of the USB port responsive to the insertion of the USB security device” (emphasis added). Ellison illustrates in FIGS. 2-4 that the blade cover member 60 is *biased against casing 20 with springs 75*. Thus, the blade cover member 60 is not “*elastically biased against a connector*” of a USB security device (emphasis added).

Since Miller, Powell, and Ellison, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest every element as recited in Applicant's independent claim 46, claim 46 is patentably distinguishable and deemed to be allowable.

Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections and allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited.

### **Rejection under 35 USC §103**

Claims 25-28, 31-32 and 46 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,189,099 to Rallis et al. (hereinafter “Rallis”) in view of Crisan and further in view of Powell. Claims 25-28, 31-32 and 46 have been alternately rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rallis in view of Crisan, and in further view of Powell and Liu. Claims 25-28, 31-32 and 46 have been also alternately rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rallis in view of Crisan and further in view of Powell and Ellison. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of these claims are earnestly solicited.

### **Claim 25**

Applicant has amended claim 25 to recite, among other things,  
attaching the USB security device to the USB port of the host computer prior to

Serial No.: 09/685,138  
Docket No.: 112-1001  
Amendment dated October 24, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of July 24, 2008

when power is applied to the host computer, the attaching operation comprising automatically sliding a cover that is elastically biased against an external surface of the USB security device backward over the exterior surface of the USB security device in a direction opposite to a direction of inserting the USB security device into the USB port when the USB security device is attached to the USB port of the host computer.

On page 22 of the Office Action, the Examiner states to “[s]ee the rejections of claims 25-28, 31-32 above for the teaching of prior art bases of rejection.”

On page 18 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Powell describes automatically sliding a cover [14, FIGs. 11-12] on a plug backward in a direction opposite a direction of inserting the plug into a port when the plug is attached to the port to expose a connector of the plug only when inserted into the port [FIGs. 11-12], and to cover the connector when the plug is not inserted into the port [FIGs. 9-10] thereby protecting the connector from damage.

The Examiner contends that

[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a sliding cover, as is taught by Powell, on the USB security device – hence automatically sliding a cover [14, FIGs. 11-12] on the USB security device backward in a direction opposite a direction of inserting the USB security device into the USB port of the host computer when the USB connector is attached to the USB port to expose the USB connector only when inserted into the USB port, in order to prevent external exposure of the USB connector and to protect the USB connector.

Applicant respectfully submits that Rallis, Crisan, and Powell, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest, among other things,

attaching the USB security device to the USB port of the host computer prior to when power is applied to the host computer, the attaching operation comprising automatically sliding a cover that is elastically biased against an external surface of the USB security device backward over the exterior surface of the USB security device in a direction opposite to a direction of inserting the USB security device into the USB port when the USB security device is attached to the USB port of the host computer.

In contrast, Powell illustrates in FIGS. 9 and 10 that retractable sheath 14 retracts *within* body 16 and cap 18, and that sheath 14 is biased against *springs* – the retractable sheath 14 is not “*elastically biased against an external surface*” of a USB security device, nor is it “retracted backward *over the exterior surface* of the USB security device” (emphasis added).

Serial No.: 09/685,138  
Docket No.: 112-1001  
Amendment dated October 24, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of July 24, 2008

Since Rallis, Crisan, and Powell, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest every element as recited in Applicant's independent claim 25, claim 25 is patentably distinguishable and deemed to be allowable.

On page 19 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Liu describes

sliding a cover [13, FIG. 2] on a plug [FIG. 2 backward in a direction opposite a direction of inserting the plug into a port when the plug is attached to the port to expose a connector [8, FIG. 2] of the plug only when inserted into the port, and to cover the connector when the plug is not inserted into the port thereby protecting the connector from damage [FIG. 2; page 3, line 6; page 3, line 2].

The Examiner contends that

"[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a sliding cover, as is taught by Powell, on the USB security device in order to protect the USB connector from being damaged and to prevent external exposure of the USB connector – as is suggested by Liu and Powell.

Applicant respectfully submits that Rallis, Crisan, Powell, and Liu, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest, among other things,

attaching the USB security device to the USB port of the host computer prior to when power is applied to the host computer, the attaching operation comprising automatically sliding a cover that is elastically biased against an external surface of the USB security device backward over the exterior surface of the USB security device in a direction opposite to a direction of inserting the USB security device into the USB port when the USB security device is attached to the USB port of the host computer.

In contrast, Powell illustrates in FIGS. 9 and 10 that retractable sheath 14 retracts *within* body 16 and cap 18, and that sheath 14 is biased against *springs* – the retractable sheath 14 is not "*elastically biased against an external surface*" of a USB security device, nor is it "retracted backward *over the exterior surface* of the USB security device" (emphasis added). Although Liu illustrates in FIG. 2 that the protective lid 13 is slidable on insulating cover handle 4, Liu fails to teach or suggest that the protective lid 13 is "*elastically biased against an external surface*" of a USB security device (emphasis added). At best, Liu illustrates in FIG. 2 that the protective lid 13 is biased against the protective lid spring 10 -- *not* that the protective lid 13 is "*elastically biased against an external surface*" the USB security device.

Since Rallis, Crisan, Powell, and Liu, whether taken alone or in combination with one



Serial No.: 09/685,138  
Docket No.: 112-1001  
Amendment dated October 24, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of July 24, 2008

another, fail to teach or suggest every element as recited in Applicant's independent claim 25, claim 25 is patentably distinguishable and deemed to be allowable.

On page 19 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Ellison describes

automatically sliding a cover [60, FIG. 5] on a plug [10, FIG. 5] backward in a direction opposite a direction of inserting the plug into a port when the plug is attached to the port to expose a connector of the plug only when inserted into the port [FIG. 4], and to cover the connector when the plug is not inserted into the port [FIG. 3] thereby protecting the connector from damage.

On pages 19 and 20 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that

[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a sliding cover, as is taught by Powell, on the USB security device in order to prevent external exposure of the USB connector and to prevent objects from coming into contact with the USB connector, and thereby protecting the USB connector from damage – as are suggested by Powell and Ellison.

Applicant respectfully submits that Rallis, Crisan, Powell, and Ellison, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest, among other things,

attaching the USB security device to the USB port of the host computer prior to when power is applied to the host computer, the attaching operation comprising automatically sliding a cover that is elastically biased against an external surface of the USB security device backward over the exterior surface of the USB security device in a direction opposite to a direction of inserting the USB security device into the USB port when the USB security device is attached to the USB port of the host computer.

In contrast, Powell illustrates in FIGS. 9 and 10 that retractable sheath 14 retracts *within* body 16 and cap 18, and that sheath 14 is biased against *springs* – the retractable sheath 14 is not “*elastically biased against an external surface*” of a USB security device, nor is it “retracted backward *over the exterior surface* of the USB security device” (emphasis added). Ellison illustrates in FIGS. 2-4 that the blade cover member 60 is slidably *inserted* into casing 20. Thus, the blade cover member 60 is not “elastically biased against an external surface” of a USB security device, nor is it “retracted backward *over the exterior surface* of the USB security device” (emphasis added).

Since Rallis, Crisan, Powell, and Ellison, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest every element as recited in Applicant's independent claim 25,

Serial No.: 09/685,138  
Docket No.: 112-1001  
Amendment dated October 24, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of July 24, 2008

claim 25 is patentably distinguishable and deemed to be allowable.

Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections and allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited.

#### Claims 26-28 and 31

With regard to claims 26-28 and 31, it is requested that for at least the reasons that these claims depend from allowable claim 25, and therefore contain each of the features as recited in claim 25, claims 26-28 are also patentable over Rallis, Crisan, and Powell, or Rallis, Crisan, Powell, and Liu, or Rallis, Crisan, Powell, and Ellison, whether taken alone or in combination with one another.

Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections and allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited.

#### Claim 32

With regard to claim 32, it is requested that for at least the reason that this claim depends from allowable claim 1, and therefore contains each of the features as recited in claim 1, claim 32 is also patentable over Rallis, Crisan, and Powell, or Rallis, Crisan, Powell, and Liu, or Rallis, Crisan, Powell, and Ellison, whether taken alone or in combination with one another.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim is earnestly solicited.

#### Claim 46

Applicant has amended claim 46 to recite, among other things,  
attaching the USB security device to the USB port of the host computer prior to the power being applied thereto, the attaching including inserting the USB security device into the USB port and thereby retracting a cover that is elastically biased against a connector and surrounds the connector on the USB security device by engaging with a periphery of the USB port responsive to the insertion of the USB security device.

On page 22 of the Office Action, the Examiner states to "[s]ee the rejections of claims

Serial No.: 09/685,138  
Docket No.: 112-1001  
Amendment dated October 24, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of July 24, 2008

25-28, 31-32 above for the teaching of prior art bases of rejection.”

On page 18 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Powell describes automatically sliding a cover [14, FIGs. 11-12] on a plug backward in a direction opposite a direction of inserting the plug into a port when the plug is attached to the port to expose a connector of the plug only when inserted into the port [FIGs. 11-12], and to cover the connector when the plug is not inserted into the port [FIGs. 9-10] thereby protecting the connector from damage.

The Examiner contends that

[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a sliding cover, as is taught by Powell, on the USB security device – hence automatically sliding a cover [14, FIGs. 11-12] on the USB security device backward in a direction opposite a direction of inserting the USB security device into the USB port of the host computer when the USB connector is attached to the USB port to expose the USB connector only when inserted into the USB port, in order to prevent external exposure of the USB connector and to protect the USB connector.

Applicant respectfully submits that Rallis, Crisan, and Powell, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest, among other things,

attaching the USB security device to the USB port of the host computer prior to the power being applied thereto, the attaching including inserting the USB security device into the USB port and thereby retracting a cover that is elastically biased against a connector and surrounds the connector on the USB security device by engaging with a periphery of the USB port responsive to the insertion of the USB security device.

In contrast, Powell illustrates in FIGS. 9 and 10 that retractable sheath 14 retracts within body 16 and cap 18, and that the sheath 14 is *biased by springs*. The retractable sheath 14 is not “elastically biased against a connector” and “surrounds the connector” on a “USB security device” that is retractable “by engaging with a periphery of the USB port responsive to the insertion of the USB security device.”

Since Rallis, Crisan, and Powell, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest every element as recited in Applicant’s independent claim 46, claim 46 is patentably distinguishable and deemed to be allowable.

On page 19 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Liu describes sliding a cover [13, FIG. 2] on a plug [FIG. 2 backward in a direction opposite a

Serial No.: 09/685,138  
Docket No.: 112-1001  
Amendment dated October 24, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of July 24, 2008

direction of inserting the plug into a port when the plug is attached to the port to expose a connector [8, FIG. 2] of the plug only when inserted into the port, and to cover the connector when the plug is not inserted into the port thereby protecting the connector from damage [FIG. 2; page 3, line 6; page 3, line 2].

The Examiner contends that

“[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a sliding cover, as is taught by Powell, on the USB security device in order to protect the USB connector from being damaged and to prevent external exposure of the USB connector – as is suggested by Liu and Powell.

Applicant respectfully submits that Rallis, Crisan, Powell, and Liu, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest, among other things,

attaching the USB security device to the USB port of the host computer prior to the power being applied thereto, the attaching including inserting the USB security device into the USB port and thereby retracting a cover that is elastically biased against a connector and surrounds the connector on the USB security device by engaging with a periphery of the USB port responsive to the insertion of the USB security device.

In contrast, Powell illustrates in FIGS. 9 and 10 that retractable sheath 14 retracts within body 16 and cap 18, and that the sheath 14 is *biased by springs*. The retractable sheath 14 is not “elastically biased against a connector” and “surrounds the connector” on a “USB security device” that is retractable “by engaging with a periphery of the USB port responsive to the insertion of the USB security device.” Although Liu illustrates in FIG. 2 that the protective lid 13 is slidable on insulating cover handle 4, Liu fails to teach or suggest that the protective lid 13 is “elastically biased against a connector” of a USB security device. At best, Liu illustrates in FIG. 2 that the protective lid 13 is biased against the protective lid spring 10 -- *not* that the protective lid 13 is “elastically biased *against a connector*” (emphasis added) of the USB security device.

Since Rallis, Crisan, Powell, and Liu, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest every element as recited in Applicant’s independent claim 46, claim 46 is patentably distinguishable and deemed to be allowable.

On page 19 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Ellison describes

automatically sliding a cover [60, FIG. 5] on a plug [10, FIG. 5] backward in a direction opposite a direction of inserting the plug into a port when the plug is attached to the port to expose a connector of the plug only when inserted into the

Serial No.: 09/685,138  
Docket No.: 112-1001  
Amendment dated October 24, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of July 24, 2008

port [FIG. 4], and to cover the connector when the plug is not inserted into the port [FIG. 3] thereby protecting the connector from damage.

On pages 19 and 20 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that

[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a sliding cover, as is taught by Powell, on the USB security device in order to prevent external exposure of the USB connector and to prevent objects from coming into contact with the USB connector, and thereby protecting the USB connector from damage – as are suggested by Powell and Ellison.

Applicant respectfully submits that Rallis, Crisan, Powell, and Ellison, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest, among other things,

attaching the USB security device to the USB port of the host computer prior to the power being applied thereto, the attaching including inserting the USB security device into the USB port and thereby retracting a cover that is elastically biased against a connector and surrounds the connector on the USB security device by engaging with a periphery of the USB port responsive to the insertion of the USB security device.

In contrast, Powell illustrates in FIGS. 9 and 10 that retractable sheath 14 retracts within body 16 and cap 18, and that the sheath 14 is *biased by springs*. The retractable sheath 14 is not “elastically biased against a connector” and “surrounds the connector” on a “USB security device” that is retractable “by engaging with a periphery of the USB port responsive to the insertion of the USB security device.” Ellison illustrates in FIGS. 2-4 that the blade cover member 60 is biased against casing 20 with springs 75. Thus, the blade cover member 60 is not “elastically biased against a *connector*” of a USB security device (emphasis added).

Since Rallis, Crisan, Powell, and Ellison, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest every element as recited in Applicant’s independent claim 46, claim 46 is patentably distinguishable and deemed to be allowable.

Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections and allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited.

Serial No.: 09/685,138  
Docket No.: 112-1001  
Amendment dated October 24, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of July 24, 2008

### **Double Patenting**

Claims 1 and 33-42 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 26-28, 47-49 and 51-56 of copending Application No. 11/410,105. As discussed above, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 33. Accordingly, reconsideration of these claims and withdrawal of these rejections are earnestly solicited.

### **Double Patenting**

Claims 2, 4-8, 22-24, 25-28 and 31-32 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 21-23 and 26-28 of copending Application No. 11/410,105 in view of Miller and/or Abbott. As discussed above, Applicant has amended independent claim 1, from which claims 2, 4-8, 22-24, and 32 depend. Applicant has also amended independent claim 25, from which claims 26-28 and 31 depend. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are patentable over the prior art of record, including Miller and/or Abbott, for at least the reasons discussed above. Accordingly, reconsideration of these claims and withdrawal of these rejections are earnestly solicited.

### **Conclusion**

It is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, there being no other objections or rejections, this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.


Serial No.: 09/685,138  
Docket No.: 112-1001  
Amendment dated October 24, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of July 24, 2008

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 502827.

Respectfully submitted,

STANZIONE & KIM, LLP

Dated: October 24, 2008  
919 18<sup>th</sup> St., NW, Suite 440  
Washington, DC 20006  
Telephone: (202) 775-1900  
Facsimile: (202) 775-1901

By:   
Kevin T. Roddy  
Registration No. 50,577